

Colorado Department of Education Consolidated State Application Accountability Workbook January 5, 2003

**for State Grants under Title IX, Part C, Section 9302 of the Elementary and
Secondary Education Act (Public Law 107-110)**

**William E. Windler
Colorado Department of Education
Assistant Commissioner
Office of Special Services
201 East Colfax
Denver, Colorado 80203
Phone: 303 866 6631
Email: windler_w@cde.state.co.us**



**U. S. Department of Education
Office of Elementary and Secondary Education
Washington, D.C. 20202**

Instructions for Completing Consolidated State Application Accountability Workbook

By January 31, 2003, States must complete and submit to the Department this Consolidated State Application Accountability Workbook. We understand that some of the critical elements for the key principles may still be under consideration and may not yet be final State policy by the January 31 due date. States that do not have final approval for some of these elements or that have not finalized a decision on these elements by January 31 should, when completing the Workbook, indicate the status of each element which is not yet official State policy and provide the anticipated date by which the proposed policy will become effective. In each of these cases, States must include a timeline of steps to complete to ensure that such elements are in place by May 1, 2003, and implemented during the 2002-2003 school year. By no later than May 1, 2003, States must submit to the Department final information for all sections of the Consolidated State Application Accountability Workbook.

Transmittal Instructions

To expedite the receipt of this Consolidated State Application Accountability Workbook, please send your submission via the Internet as a .doc file, pdf file, rtf or .txt file or provide the URL for the site where your submission is posted on the Internet. Send electronic submissions to conapp@ed.gov.

A State that submits only a paper submission should mail the submission by express courier to:

Celia Sims
U.S. Department of Education
400 Maryland Ave., SW
Room 3W300
Washington, D.C. 20202-6400
(202) 401-0113

PART I: Summary of Required Elements for State Accountability Systems

Instructions

The following chart is an overview of States' implementation of the critical elements required for approval of their State accountability systems. States must provide detailed implementation information for each of these elements in Part II of this Consolidated State Application Accountability Workbook.

For each of the elements listed in the following chart, States should indicate the current implementation status in their State using the following legend:

- F:** State has a final policy, approved by all the required entities in the State (e.g., State Board of Education, State Legislature), for implementing this element in its accountability system.
- P:** State has a proposed policy for implementing this element in its accountability system, but must still receive approval by required entities in the State (e.g., State Board of Education, State Legislature).
- W:** State is still working on formulating a policy to implement this element in its accountability system.

**Summary of Implementation Status for Required Elements of
State Accountability Systems**

Status	State Accountability System Element	
Principle 1: All Schools		
F	1.1	Accountability system includes <i>all schools and districts in the state</i> .
F	1.2	Accountability system holds <i>all schools to the same criteria</i> .
F	1.3	Accountability system incorporates the <i>academic achievement standards</i> .
F	1.4	Accountability system provides <i>information in a timely manner</i> .
F	1.5	Accountability system includes <i>report cards</i> .
F	1.6	Accountability system includes <i>rewards and sanctions</i> .
Principle 2: All Students		
F	2.1	The accountability system includes <i>all students</i>
F	2.2	The accountability system has a consistent definition of <i>full academic year</i> .
F	2.3	The accountability system properly includes <i>mobile students</i> .
Principle 3: Method of AYP Determinations		
F	3.1	Accountability system expects <i>all student subgroups, public schools, and LEAs to reach proficiency by 2013-14</i> .
F	3.2	Accountability system has a method for determining whether <i>student subgroups, public schools, and LEAs made adequate yearly progress</i> .
F	3.2a	Accountability system establishes a <i>starting point</i> .
F	3.2b	Accountability system establishes <i>statewide annual measurable objectives</i> .
F	3.2c	Accountability system establishes <i>intermediate goals</i> .
Principle 4: Annual Decisions		
F	4.1	The accountability system <i>determines annually the progress</i> of schools and districts.

STATUS Legend:

F – Final state policy

P – Proposed policy, awaiting State approval

W – Working to formulate policy

Principle 5: Subgroup Accountability

F	5.1	The accountability system <i>includes all the required student subgroups</i> .
F	5.2	The accountability system holds <i>schools and LEAs accountable for the progress of student subgroups</i> .
F	5.3	The accountability system includes <i>students with disabilities</i> .
F	5.4	The accountability system includes <i>limited English proficient students</i> .
F	5.5	The State has determined the minimum number of students sufficient to yield statistically reliable information for each purpose for which disaggregated data are used.
F	5.6	The State has strategies to protect the privacy of individual students in reporting achievement results and in determining whether schools and LEAs are making adequate yearly progress on the basis of disaggregated subgroups.

Principle 6: Based on Academic Assessments

F	6.1	Accountability system is based <i>primarily on academic assessments</i> .
---	-----	---

Principle 7: Additional Indicators

F	7.1	Accountability system includes <i>graduation rate for high schools</i> .
F	7.2	Accountability system includes an <i>additional academic indicator for elementary and middle schools</i> .
F	7.3	Additional indicators are valid and reliable.

Principle 8: Separate Decisions for Reading/Language Arts and Mathematics

F	8.1	Accountability system holds students, schools and districts separately accountable for <i>reading/language arts and mathematics</i> .
---	-----	---

Principle 9: System Validity and Reliability

F	9.1	Accountability system produces <i>reliable decisions</i> .
F	9.2	Accountability system produces <i>valid decisions</i> .
F	9.3	State has a plan for addressing <i>changes in assessment and student population</i> .

Principle 10: Participation Rate

F	10.1	Accountability system has a means for calculating the <i>rate of participation</i> in the statewide assessment.
F	10.2	Accountability system has a means for <i>applying the 95% assessment criteria to student subgroups and small schools</i> .

STATUS Legend:

F – Final policy

P – Proposed Policy, awaiting State approval

W– Working to formulate policy

PART II: State Response and Activities for Meeting State Accountability System Requirements

Instructions

In Part II of this Workbook, States are to provide detailed information for each of the critical elements required for State accountability systems. States should answer the questions asked about each of the critical elements in the State's accountability system. States that do not have final approval for any of these elements or that have not finalized a decision on these elements by January 31, 2003, should, when completing this section of the Workbook, indicate the status of each element that is not yet official State policy and provide the anticipated date by which the proposed policy will become effective. In each of these cases, States must include a timeline of steps to complete to ensure that such elements are in place by May 1, 2003, and implemented during the 2002-2003 school year. By no later than May 1, 2003, States must submit to the Department final information for all sections of the Consolidated State Application Accountability Workbook.

Reader Guide: – After each principle, a summary of compliance is outlined. Attachment “A” (beginning on page 77) provides detailed information on AYP calculations. The following introductory section, AYP at a glance, is intended as a quick reference for NCLB implementation efforts in Colorado. The evidence of compliance submitted to the Peer Reviewers on December 17, 2002 is not included. However, this application does include further detail and explanation in each area identified as needing clarification by the Peer Reviewers and ED staff.

Adequate Yearly Progress, at-a-glance

Critical Element	Colorado’s Proposal
1.1 Inclusion in the accountability system of all schools, districts, and the State	An AYP determination will be made annually for the State, all school districts, all schools, and all required student subgroups.
1.2 Same criteria used in determining AYP for schools and LEAs	<p>The targets and criteria will be the same for the State, all school districts, all schools and all required student subgroups.</p> <p>Colorado’s state assessment system does not test students until grade 3. For K-2 schools, AYP will be defined as annual increases in grade-level performance using locally administered assessments – consistent with Colorado’s Basic Literacy Act. Targets will be set such that all 2nd graders will be performing at grade level in reading and math by 2013-14. Colorado’s Basic Literacy Act allows the use of only certain locally administered reading assessments. A similar list of math assessments will be developed in consultation with the State Board, local school boards, the Colorado Council of Teachers of Mathematics, and other stakeholders.</p>
1.3 Performance levels	<p>Basic = Unsatisfactory Proficient = Partially proficient, proficient Advanced = Advanced</p> <p>Colorado’s standards for all students remain high in comparison to most states. Colorado’s basic proficiency level on CSAP is also high in comparison to most states. Education Week’s 2002 <i>Annual Quality Counts Report</i> gives Colorado high marks for its standards.</p> <p><i>Note: Colorado will submit its above referenced proficiency levels to the United States Department of Education’s Standards and Assessment Office in Title I for final approval.</i></p>
1.4 Timeliness of AYP decisions	CSAP administrations occur in February and March of each year. CSAP results are available in July. AYP determinations will be made during the month of August allowing time for notification to parents of school choice and supplemental service options.
1.5 State Report Card	Yes, the State already makes most of the information available through Accountability Reports. Additional elements are being added for 2002-2003. The State is

	gearing-up to ensure that all of the required data elements are included and that information is presented in a manner that is consistent with the regulations.
1.6 Rewards and Sanctions	<p>Ten Title I schools will be identified as Title I distinguished schools. One Title I school in each of the 8 educational regions will be identified and receive a \$5,000 award. Two schools from the State will be selected to receive \$10,000 awards. Title I Distinguished schools and their personnel will be utilized as part of the State's School Support System. Criteria for rewards considers current performance levels, growth in performance levels, and closing of achievement gaps across student subgroups.</p> <p>All Title I schools and LEAs failing to make AYP for two consecutive years will be identified for Improvement. Schools must develop an improvement plan and offer school choice. 2nd year Improvement schools must offer choice and supplemental services. Corrective action schools must offer choice, supplemental services, and begin considering options for reconstitution, restructuring, etc. as per the legislation.</p>
2.1 All students are included in the State's accountability system	All students are included in the State's accountability system. Those students not participating in the state assessment are counted as a "zero" for the purpose of accountability.
2.2, 2.3 Full Academic Year	<p>Student enrollment information is collected as part of the CSAP administration process. For accountability purposes, full academic year will be defined as follows:</p> <p>School = Students continuously enrolled in a school from one CSAP administration to the next CSAP administration (12+ months). For students at the transitional grades (e.g., grade 3, grade 6, and grade 9), we will look at students continuously enrolled in the districts from one CSAP administration to the next (12+ months).</p> <p>District = Students continuously enrolled in the districts from one CSAP administration to the next CSAP administration (12+ months).</p> <p>State= Students continuously enrolled in a school in the state from one CSAP administration to the next CSAP administration.</p> <p>Students not captured as part of a subgroup will be accounted for as part of the school's AYP. Students not captured as part of the school's AYP will be accounted for as part of the district's AYP. Students not accounted for as part of the district's AYP will be part of the State's AYP determination.</p>

<p>3.2a AYP Starting Point</p>	<p>CSAPs were broken up by grade spans: For elementary, grades 3 to 5 were used. Middle school, grades 6 through 8 were used. And high school, grades 9 and 10 were used. Average CSAP proficiency percentages were calculated for each school at each grade span. Schools were sorted by grade span and ranked from highest to lowest based on performance. Beginning with the lowest performing school and moving up, enrollments were added together until 20 percent of the State's enrollment for that grade span was captured. The score of the school at the 20th percentile of enrollment is the score that is used for the starting point. Starting points were calculated separately for reading and math.</p> <p>In every case the proficiency percentage of the school at the 20th percentile was higher than the percentage of the lowest performing subgroup.</p> <p>Starting points for each of the grade spans are as follows:</p> <p>Elementary reading: 77.5% Middle School reading: 74.6% High School reading: 80.3%</p> <p>Elementary math: 79.5% Middle School math: 60.7% High School math: 50.5%</p>
<p>3.2 AYP determination</p>	<p>In order for schools and LEAs to make AYP, each must:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Achieve a 95% participation rate in CSAP as a whole and for each student subgroup. 2. Reach AYP targets in reading and math as a whole and for each student subgroup. <p>If AYP targets are not met, a school or LEA could make AYP if the group not making AYP reduces the percentage of non-proficient students by 10% from the previous year's percentage and reaches performance targets for the other indicators (graduation rate for high schools and the percentage of students performing at the advanced level of proficiency in reading and math for elementary and middle schools.</p>
<p>3.1 100% proficiency by 2013-14, measurable objectives and goals</p>	<p>Measurable objectives and targets have been established such that they yield 100% proficiency for the State, LEAs, schools, and all required subgroups by 2013-14. Using the starting points for each content area and grade span, the amount of annual growth necessary to reach 100% within the 12 year period was calculated. Annual objectives and goals were set based on the growth line. Separate targets were set for each of the three grade levels: elementary, middle, and high school.</p>

	<p>Separate targets were set in reading and math.</p> <p>All Title I LEAs and schools in the LEAs and schools that fail to achieve identified objectives and goals for two consecutive years will be identified for Improvement.</p>
3.2b State's annual measurable objectives	<p>See charts.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Measurable objectives are consistent with intermediate goals. Intermediate goals are consistent with the State's starting point. 2. Measurable objectives are set to ensure 100% proficiency within the timeline. 3. Measurable objectives and goals are the same for the State, every LEA, every school, and all required subgroups of students.
3.2c State's intermediate AYP goals	<p>See charts and see above.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The first incremental increase occurs during the 2004-05 school year. 2. Each incremental increase occurs not more than 3 years after that point.
4.1 Annual determination	<p>AYP determinations will be made annually for each public school and school district in Colorado. The State's single accountability system, state accreditation, applies to all public schools and school districts. AYP is now an integral component of districts and school accreditation. All NCLB reporting requirements have been incorporated into state accreditation.</p>
5.1 Required student subgroups	<p>Information used to disaggregate students into the required student subgroups is collected as part of the CSAP administration process. Free/Reduced lunch (economically disadvantaged) data was not collected as part of the 2002 CSAP administration but will be collected in 2003. All other required subgroup data is currently available.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Economically disadvantaged – Students on free or reduced lunch. 2. Race/ethnicity – White, Hispanic, Black, Native American, Asian/Pacific Islander 3. Students with disabilities – students with IEPs 4. Limited English Proficient – currently enrolled in ESL or Bilingual program, not yet reclassified.
5.2 Accountability for progress of student subgroups	<p>LEAs – each LEA as a whole and all of its required subgroups must reach annual performance targets in reading and math in order for the LEA to make AYP.</p> <p>School – each school as a whole and all of its required subgroups must reach annual performance targets in reading and math in order for the school to make AYP.</p>
5.3 Students with disabilities	<p>All students with disabilities participate in the CSAP or CSAP –Alternate.</p> <p>All CSAP and CSAP-A results for students with disabilities are included as part of the AYP equation.</p>

	<p>Currently, less than 1% (0.8%) of students take the CSAP-A. CSAP-A performance levels are aligned to CSAP performance levels as follows:</p> <p>Exploring = Unsatisfactory Emerging = Partially Proficient Developing = Proficient Novice = Advanced</p>
5.4 Limited English Proficient Students	<p>All CSAP results for limited-English proficient students are included as part of the AYP equation, including the results for students taking the Spanish language assessments. Depending on the student's level of English proficiency, he or she may take the test in English or Spanish. Most students take the CSAP. In any event, students certified as LEP will be tested in English after they have been in the U.S. for three consecutive years. Students who have been enrolled in a bi-lingual program for less than 3 years can be assessed in Spanish. Those that do not take the CSAP in English or Spanish must turn in a blank test booklet and be counted as a "zero" for accountability purposes.</p>
5.5 Minimum number of students in a subgroup required for reporting and accountability	<p>The minimum number of students in a group required for CSAP reporting is 16.</p> <p>For the purpose of accountability, the minimum number of students will be 30. If a school or LEA has 30 or more students in a required subgroup, then that school or LEA must meet annual performance targets set by the State.</p> <p>Schools and LEAs must meet the measurable objectives and goals set by the State regardless of the number of students tested.</p> <p>In order to avoid misidentification of LEAs and schools, the State will employ a 95% Confidence Interval in making AYP determinations. This will be applied in making determinations for LEAs as a whole, schools as a whole, and for all required subgroups of 30 or more students at the LEA and school level.</p>
5.6 Privacy	<p>Results are not reported for schools or LEAs with an "n" of 16 or fewer. The AYP definition does not reveal personally identifiable information.</p>
6.1 AYP based primarily on academic assessments	<p>The definition of AYP considers the following in making a determination:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Proficiency in reading and math as assessed in the CSAP 2. Advanced levels of proficiency in reading and math for elementary and middle schools. 3. Graduation rate for high schools. 4. For K-2 schools, AYP decisions will be based on the

	<p>percentage of students performing at grade level in reading and math as determined using approved local assessments.</p> <p>Colorado's state assessment system includes reading assessments for grades 3 through 10, and math assessments for grades 5 through 10. Math assessments for grades 3 and 4 will be added in 2004. Results of all assessments will be used in making AYP determinations.</p>
7.1 Definition of graduation rate	<p>Under Colorado law, local school boards are responsible for establishing the requirements for high school graduation. Requirements vary from district to district. However, the State calculates graduation rates in a uniform manner for all school districts. The graduation rate does not include students who obtain a GED or certificate of completion without completing the locally-defined requirements for graduation. The graduation rate is a cumulative or longitudinal rate that considers the number of students who actually graduate as a percent of those who were in membership and could have graduated over a 4-year period from grade 9 through 12. The definition does not allow for the inclusion of dropouts and does not allow the use of transfer to avoid counting a student as a dropout.</p>
7.2 Other indicator for elementary and middle schools	<p>The other indicator that will be used in determining AYP of elementary and secondary schools will be the percentage of students performing at the advanced level of proficiency on CSAP math and reading assessments. Advanced proficiency is a data element that is collected for all schools and LEAs. It is measured in the same way for all LEAs and schools. And, it is a data element that can be disaggregated at the school and LEA level. The CSAP is federally approved.</p> <p>The starting point for the other elementary and middle school indicator will be set using the advanced proficiency rate of the lowest performing subgroup of students. LEAs, schools, and subgroups of students will be required to meet or exceed the performance targets set for school year 2004-2005.</p> <p>All LEAs and schools will be expected to reach performance targets for advanced proficiency in addition to meeting their targets for increases in proficiency in order to make AYP.</p> <p>If employing the "safe harbor" provision, the performance of individual subgroups of students will have to meet or exceed the state performance targets set for advanced proficiency in reading and math.</p>
7.3 Validity and reliability of other indicators	<p>Yes. CSAP meets all nationally recognized standards for validity and reliability.</p>

8.1 Separate determination made in math and language arts	A separate determination is made annually in reading and math. An LEA or school must reach performance targets in both content areas in order to make AYP.
9.1 AYP determinations and the State's standard for acceptable reliability	To increase the reliability of AYP determinations at the LEA, school, and subgroup level, CDE is employing a 95% Confidence Interval. Targets for LEAs, schools, and subgroups of 30 or more students will be set using a 95% Confidence Interval. That is, a single performance target will be replaced with a band of targets based on the number of students included in the calculation. LEAs, schools, and subgroups of students scoring within the range of targets will be considered to have made AYP.
9.2 Valid AYP decisions	Colorado's appeal process is consistent with the requirements of NCLB with regard to submission of evidence and timelines. Schools may appeal AYP determinations to their LEA, submit evidence, and expect a final determination within the 30 day timeline prescribed by the NCLB legislation. Similarly, LEAs may appeal an AYP determination to the State, submit evidence, and expect a final determination within the 30 days prescribed by the NCLB legislation.
9.3 Anticipated changes in assessments	Colorado will add 3 rd and 4 th grade math assessments in 2004. Colorado will handle the addition of the new assessments as follows. For example, the use of multi-year averaging – 2002 and 2003 results compared with 2004 and 2005 results. Or, establishing new baselines after the new math assessments are added and measuring 2004 to 2005 progress against the newly established 2004 baselines. AYP determinations from 2003 to 2004 would not include the new math assessments.
10.1 Participation rates	Currently, Colorado tracks the number of students who take the test and the number who do not. Both students who take the test and those who do not are included in the state's accountability system. For example, students for whom there is a blank booklet are counted as a zero for accountability purposes.
10.2 95% tested requirement	Ninety-five percent of students in a school must be tested and 95% of students in required student subgroups of 30 or more must be tested in order for a school to be considered to have made AYP. However, it is advantageous for LEAs and schools to test as many students as possible as those that are not tested are counted as zeroes for accountability purposes.

PRINCIPLE 1. A single statewide Accountability System applied to all public schools and LEAs.

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF NOT MEETING REQUIREMENTS
<p>1.1 How does the State Accountability System include every public school and LEA in the State?</p>	<p>Every public school and LEA is required to make adequate yearly progress and is included in the State Accountability System.</p> <p>State has a definition of “public school” and “LEA” for AYP accountability purposes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The State Accountability System produces AYP decisions for all public schools, including public schools with variant grade configurations (e.g., K-12), public schools that serve special populations (e.g., alternative public schools, juvenile institutions, state public schools for the blind) and public charter schools. It also holds accountable public schools with no grades assessed (e.g., K-2). 	<p>A public school or LEA is not required to make adequate yearly progress and is not included in the State Accountability System.</p> <p>State policy systematically excludes certain public schools and/or LEAs.</p>

STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS

All conditions are met. Colorado's accountability system includes every public school and LEA in the state. The state has defined AYP pursuant to the statute and rules. CDE will apply AYP to all instructional levels (elementary, middle/junior high, and high school). AYP will also be calculated for variant grade configurations and schools that serve special populations, including the Colorado School for the Deaf and Blind.

Evidence of compliance was submitted to the Peer Reviewers on December 17, 2002.

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF <i>NOT</i> MEETING REQUIREMENTS
1.2 How are all public schools and LEAs held to the same criteria when making an AYP determination?	<p>All public schools and LEAs are systematically judged on the basis of the same criteria when making an AYP determination.</p> <p>If applicable, the AYP definition is integrated into the State Accountability System.</p>	<p>Some public schools and LEAs are systematically judged on the basis of alternate criteria when making an AYP determination.</p>

STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS

Colorado's state assessment system (CSAP) does not include students until grade 3. AYP will be defined for schools with K-1 and K-2 students than for those schools containing grades 3 and higher. K-1 and K-2 school AYP will be determined using the elements and assessments used to implement Colorado's Basic Literacy Act. CDE's definition of AYP establishes baselines using 2002 data for all schools. All schools will be expected to yield annual results that will result in 100% proficiency in reading in math by 2013-2014. School districts will be required to use locally administered assessments to determine AYP in K-1 and K-2 schools in mathematics.

AYP for all instructional levels and all schools has been integrated into Colorado's single accountability system, state accreditation.

Evidence of compliance was submitted to the Peer Reviewers on December 17, 2002.

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF NOT MEETING REQUIREMENTS
<p>1.3 Does the State have, at a minimum, a definition of <i>basic</i>, <i>proficient</i> and <i>advanced</i> student achievement levels in reading/language arts and mathematics?</p>	<p>State has defined three levels of student achievement: <i>basic</i>, <i>proficient</i> and <i>advanced</i>.¹</p> <p>Student achievement levels of <i>proficient</i> and <i>advanced</i> determine how well students are mastering the materials in the State's academic content standards; and the <i>basic</i> level of achievement provides complete information about the progress of lower-achieving students toward mastering the <i>proficient</i> and <i>advanced</i> levels.</p>	<p>Standards do not meet the legislated requirements.</p>

¹ System of State achievement standards will be reviewed by the Standards and Assessments Peer Review. The Accountability Peer Review will determine that achievement levels are used in determining AYP.

STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS

Colorado has defined three levels of student achievement: basic, proficient and advanced. Colorado's CSAP has four instructional levels designed to give greater detail to school personnel to better align the state academic content standards to instruction at the classroom level. Colorado is in the process of implementing an individual student identifier system this year. This will also assist teachers in designing their instructional strategies around the needs for each and every child. This, of course, will assist schools in meeting AYP goals. Of course, all data will be disaggregated among all required student sub-populations to give the teachers even more insight into designing their instructional programs so that the school can meet its AYP goals.

For the purposes of calculating AYP and reporting AYP, partially proficient and proficient ranges will be considered proficient to determine the value-added growth that the schools and districts as institutions are delivering to public school students.

Colorado's standards for all students remain high in comparison to most states. Colorado's basic proficiency level on CSAP is also high in comparison to most states. Education Week's 2002 *Annual Quality Counts Report* gives Colorado high marks for its standards.

Note: Colorado will submit its above referenced proficiency levels to the United States Department of Education's Standards and Assessment Office in Title I for final approval.

Evidence of compliance was submitted to the Peer Reviewers on December 17, 2002.

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF NOT MEETING REQUIREMENTS
<p>1.4 How does the State provide accountability and adequate yearly progress decisions and information in a timely manner?</p>	<p>State provides decisions about adequate yearly progress in time for LEAs to implement the required provisions before the beginning of the next academic year.</p> <p>State allows enough time to notify parents about public school choice or supplemental educational service options, time for parents to make an informed decision, and time to implement public school choice and supplemental educational services.</p>	<p>Timeline does not provide sufficient time for LEAs to fulfill their responsibilities before the beginning of the next academic year.</p>

STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS

CSAP results are provided to schools and districts by the end of July each year, which is prior to the start of the academic school year.

CDE will use CSAP data as soon as they are available to work with LEA's in calculating whether LEA's and their schools have made AYP. A determination of AYP will be made prior to the beginning of each school year.

All LEA's will be required to offer choice to students enrolled in first year school improvement schools. LEA's are also required to provide choice and supplementary services and take corrective actions appropriate to the number of years on school improvement or corrective action. The established timelines are all consistent with NCLB.

As a matter of fact, over 100 schools are offering choice and transportation to schools already on first year school improvement or corrective action for the 2002-2003 school year. Another group of schools is also offering choice and supplementary services to its students. Colorado has aggressively implemented these requirements.

Evidence of compliance was submitted to the Peer Reviewers on December 17, 2002.

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF NOT MEETING REQUIREMENTS
<p>1.5 Does the State Accountability System produce an annual State Report Card?</p>	<p>The State Report Card includes all the required data elements [see Appendix A for the list of required data elements].</p> <p>The State Report Card is available to the public at the beginning of the academic year.</p> <p>The State Report Card is accessible in languages of major populations in the State, to the extent possible.</p> <p>Assessment results and other academic indicators (including graduation rates) are reported by student subgroups</p>	<p>The State Report Card does not include all the required data elements.</p> <p>The State Report Card is not available to the public.</p>

STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS

CDE currently reports most of the current data annually based upon the School Accountability Report requirements. Before the beginning of the 2003-2004 school year, CDE's annual year end report will be updated to include all of the requirements listed in Appendix A of this workbook. All data is and will continue to be available on CDE's website. CDE makes and will continue to make this data available to the press all around the state. To the extent possible, this information will also be made available in Spanish and in other languages when practicable.

This report will also include information about the state's approved list of supplementary service providers.

Evidence of compliance was submitted to the Peer Reviewers on December 17, 2002.

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF <i>NOT</i> MEETING REQUIREMENTS
<p>1.6 How does the State Accountability System include rewards and sanctions for public schools and LEAs?²</p>	<p>State uses one or more types of rewards and sanctions, where the criteria are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Set by the State; • Based on adequate yearly progress decisions; and, • Applied uniformly across public schools and LEAs. 	<p>State does not implement rewards or sanctions for public schools and LEAs based on adequate yearly progress.</p>

² The state must provide rewards and sanctions for all public schools and LEAs for making adequate yearly progress, except that the State is not required to hold schools and LEAs not receiving Title I funds to the requirements of section 1116 of NCLB [§200.12(b)(40)].

STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS

The Colorado School Awards Program was created in the 2000 Colorado General Assembly to present financial awards to the highest performing and the most improved schools in the state.

The John Irwin Schools of Excellence Awards target the highest performing schools and the Governor's Distinguished Improvement Awards focus on the most improved schools.

Colorado will continue to assess the progress of all public schools and districts in the state toward the goal of 100% proficiency in reading and math by the end of the 2013-2014 school year. School and LEA's that exceed AYP growth targets for two or more years or have significantly made gains to close the achievement gap will be eligible for Title I Academic Achievement Awards.

Per the requirements of NCLB, sanctions and interventions will be imposed on all public schools through its single accountability system, state accreditation. Title I schools and districts must also meet the specific NCLB Title I requirements.

Evidence of compliance was submitted to the Peer Reviewers on December 17, 2002.

PRINCIPLE 2. All students are included in the State Accountability System.

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF NOT MEETING REQUIREMENTS
2.1 How does the State Accountability System include all students in the State?	<p>All students in the State are included in the State Accountability System.</p> <p>The definitions of “public school” and “LEA” account for all students enrolled in the public school district, regardless of program or type of public school.</p>	<p>Public school students exist in the State for whom the State Accountability System makes no provision.</p>

STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS

This requirement is fully met. All students are accounted for on either the CSAP or the CSAP-Alternate for a very limited number of special needs students. CSAP administration guides and training activities assure compliance with these requirements along with very stringent testing administration procedures.

Evidence of compliance was submitted to the Peer Reviewers on December 17, 2002.

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF NOT MEETING REQUIREMENTS
2.2 How does the State define “full academic year” for identifying students in AYP decisions?	<p>The State has a definition of “full academic year” for determining which students are to be included in decisions about AYP.</p> <p>The definition of full academic year is consistent and applied statewide.</p>	<p>LEAs have varying definitions of “full academic year.”</p> <p>The State’s definition excludes students who must transfer from one district to another as they advance to the next grade.</p> <p>The definition of full academic year is not applied consistently.</p>

STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS

CSAP results are reported according to the students' length of time in school as well as their length of time in the district. Categories of reporting include those students in school for 12 or more consecutive months.

For the purpose of determining AYP of schools, CDE will use the scores of students enrolled in that school from one CSAP administration to the next. This also constitutes Colorado's definition of one academic year.

For the purposes of determining AYP for school districts, the scores of all students attending district schools for one academic year will be included in the calculations. Students not included in the school AYP calculations will be included in the districts AYP calculations. Students not in the school or district for one academic year will be included in the state's AYP calculations.

These definitions and procedures apply to all schools and districts statewide.

Evidence of compliance was submitted to the Peer Reviewers on December 17, 2002.

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF NOT MEETING REQUIREMENTS
<p>2.3 How does the State Accountability System determine which students have attended the same public school and/or LEA for a full academic year?</p>	<p>State holds public schools accountable for students who were enrolled at the same public school for a full academic year.</p> <p>State holds LEAs accountable for students who transfer during the full academic year from one public school within the district to another public school within the district.</p>	<p>State definition requires students to attend the same public school for more than a full academic year to be included in public school accountability.</p> <p>State definition requires students to attend school in the same district for more than a full academic year to be included in district accountability.</p> <p>State holds public schools accountable for students who have not attended the same public school for a full academic year.</p>

STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS

CSAP results are reported according to the students' length of time in school as well as their length of time in the district. Categories of reporting include those students in school for 12 or more consecutive months.

For the purpose of determining AYP of schools, CDE will use the scores of students enrolled in that school from one CSAP administration to the next. This also constitutes Colorado's definition of one academic year.

For the purposes of determining AYP for school districts, the scores of all students attending district schools for one academic year will be included in the calculations. Students not included in the school AYP calculations will be included in the districts AYP calculations. Students not in the school or district for one academic year will be included in the state's AYP calculations.

These definitions and procedures apply to all schools and districts statewide.

Evidence of compliance was submitted to the Peer Reviewers on December 17, 2002.

PRINCIPLE 3. State definition of AYP is based on expectations for growth in student achievement that is continuous and substantial, such that all students are proficient in reading/language arts and mathematics no later than 2013-2014.

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF NOT MEETING REQUIREMENTS
<p>3.1 How does the State's definition of adequate yearly progress require all students to be proficient in reading/language arts and mathematics by the 2013-2014 academic year?</p>	<p>The State has a timeline for ensuring that all students will meet or exceed the State's proficient level of academic achievement in reading/language arts³ and mathematics, not later than 2013-2014.</p>	<p>State definition does not require all students to achieve proficiency by 2013-2014.</p> <p>State extends the timeline past the 2013-2014 academic year.</p>

³ If the state has separate assessments to cover its language arts standards (e.g., reading and writing), the State must create a method to include scores from all the relevant assessments.

STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS

CDE has defined AYP as the progress necessary to move from baselines established in 2002 to 100% proficiency by the end of the 2013-2014 school year. AYP will be assessed separately in reading and math.

Please refer to Attachment “A” for further details.

Evidence of compliance was submitted to the Peer Reviewers on December 17, 2002.

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF NOT MEETING REQUIREMENTS
<p>3.2 How does the State Accountability System determine whether each student subgroup, public school and LEA makes AYP?</p>	<p>For a public school and LEA to make adequate yearly progress, each student subgroup must meet or exceed the State annual measurable objectives, each student subgroup must have at least a 95% participation rate in the statewide assessments, and the school must meet the State's requirement for other academic indicators.</p> <p>However, if in any particular year the student subgroup does not meet those annual measurable objectives, the public school or LEA may be considered to have made AYP, if the percentage of students in that group who did not meet or exceed the proficient level of academic achievement on the State assessments for that year decreased by 10% of that percentage from the preceding public school year; that group made progress on one or more of the State's academic indicators; and that group had at least 95% participation rate on the statewide assessment.</p>	<p>State uses different method for calculating how public schools and LEAs make AYP.</p>

STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS

Data collected as a part of the CSAP administration procedures will be used to disaggregate the information into each of the required student sub-populations to determine AYP and to assist the classroom teacher with his/her instructional practice.

AYP will be determined using 2002 data as the baseline. The starting points are calculated pursuant to NCLB and rule requirements. Attachment “A” details the starting points for reading and math at each of the three instructional levels. The same starting point and annual, measurable goals apply to all student sub-populations resulting in 100% proficiency of all students by 2013-2014.

In calculating AYP for student sub-populations, thirty or more students must be included in each student sub-population to protect student identity and to assure high levels of reliability. Ninety-five percent of students in each applicable student sub-group must be tested in order for the school to make AYP.

In calculating AYP, any student sub-population that did not meet the AYP goal, but did decrease the percentage of students in the applicable student sub-group by 10% or more, the school or district will then be judged to have made AYP if the LEA or school also meets the state’s other criteria when using the safe harbor provision (graduation rate for high school and the appropriate percent of students scoring “advanced” on CSAP in elementary and middle schools). Goals must be met for all applicable student sub-populations.

All students’ scores will be used as an aggregate to determine the AYP of schools as a whole. All schools’ scores will be used as an aggregate to determine the AYP of school districts.

Please refer to Attachment “A” for details. This attachment includes the Peer Reviewer recommendations provided to CDE on December 17, 2002.

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF NOT MEETING REQUIREMENTS
<p>3.2a What is the State's starting point for calculating Adequate Yearly Progress?</p>	<p>Using data from the 2001-2002 school year, the State established separate starting points in reading/language arts and mathematics for measuring the percentage of students meeting or exceeding the State's proficient level of academic achievement.</p> <p>Each starting point is based, at a minimum, on the higher of the following percentages of students at the proficient level: (1) the percentage in the State of proficient students in the lowest-achieving student subgroup; or, (2) the percentage of proficient students in a public school at the 20th percentile of the State's total enrollment among all schools ranked by the percentage of students at the proficient level.</p> <p>A State may use these procedures to establish separate starting points by grade span; however, the starting point must be the same for all like schools (e.g., one same starting point for all elementary schools, one same starting point for all middle schools...)</p>	<p>The State Accountability System uses a different method for calculating the starting point (or baseline data).</p>

STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS

Using data from 2002, CDE has established starting points of proficiency separately in reading and math for each instructional level. The same starting point for reading and math applies to each student sub-population for each of the three instructional levels.

The starting points were determined using the percentage of proficient students in a public school at the 20th percentile of the State's total enrollment among all schools ranked by the percentage of students at the proficient level.

CDE is using thirty as the threshold for establishing baselines among the various student sub-populations to protect student identity and to assure accuracy and reliability of data. Bands of confidence are also incorporated into AYP calculations. Only those student scores that have been in the school for one full academic year will be used in AYP calculations.

Please refer to Attachment "A" for details. This attachment includes the recommendations of the Peer Reviewers from December 17, 2002.

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF NOT MEETING REQUIREMENTS
3.2b What are the State's annual measurable objectives for determining adequate yearly progress?	<p>State has annual measurable objectives that are consistent with a state's intermediate goals and that identify for each year a minimum percentage of students who must meet or exceed the proficient level of academic achievement on the State's academic assessments.</p> <p>The State's annual measurable objectives ensure that all students meet or exceed the State's proficient level of academic achievement within the timeline.</p> <p>The State's annual measurable objectives are the same throughout the State for each public school, each LEA, and each subgroup of students.</p>	<p>The State Accountability System uses another method for calculating annual measurable objectives.</p> <p>The State Accountability System does not include annual measurable objectives.</p>

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF NOT MEETING REQUIREMENTS
<p>STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS</p> <p>CDE's definition of AYP includes all of the above referenced criteria. Colorado has set annual measurable objectives that are consistent with the state's intermediate goals and specifically identify for each year a minimum percentage of students who must meet or exceed the proficient level of academic achievement on CSAP.</p> <p>AYP goals for Colorado ensure that all students will meet or exceed proficiency in reading and math separately by the 2013-2014 school year.</p> <p>Colorado's AYP goals are the same throughout the state for each public school, each school district, and each subgroup of students.</p> <p>Please refer to Attachment "A". This information includes all of the recommendations made by the Peer Reviewers on December 17, 2002.</p>		

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF NOT MEETING REQUIREMENTS
3.2c What are the State's intermediate goals for determining adequate yearly progress?	<p>State has established intermediate goals that increase in equal increments over the period covered by the State timeline.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The first incremental increase takes effect not later than the 2004-2005 academic year.• Each following incremental increase occurs within three years.	<p>The State uses another method for calculating intermediate goals.</p> <p>The State does not include intermediate goals in its definition of adequate yearly progress.</p>

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF NOT MEETING REQUIREMENTS
<p>STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS</p> <p>Intermediate goals have been set that increase in equal increments over time. The first increase takes place during the 2004-2005 academic year. All following incremental increases occur within each three year period.</p> <p>Please refer to Attachment “A”. This information includes all of the recommendations of the Peer Reviewers from December 17, 2002.</p>		

PRINCIPLE 4. State makes annual decisions about the achievement of all public schools and LEAs.

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF <i>NOT</i> MEETING REQUIREMENTS
4.1 How does the State Accountability System make an annual determination of whether each public school and LEA in the State made AYP?	AYP decisions for each public school and LEA are made annually. ⁴	AYP decisions for public schools and LEAs are not made annually.

⁴ Decisions may be based upon several years of data and data may be averaged across grades within a public school [§1111(b)(2)(J)].

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF NOT MEETING REQUIREMENTS
<p>STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS</p> <p>AYP decisions will be made annually for each public school and school district in Colorado. The state's single accountability system, state accreditation applies to all public schools and school districts. AYP is now an integral component of district and school accreditation. All NCLB reporting requirements have now been incorporated into state accreditation reporting requirements.</p>		

PRINCIPLE 5. All public schools and LEAs are held accountable for the achievement of individual subgroups.

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF <i>NOT</i> MEETING REQUIREMENTS
5.1 How does the definition of adequate yearly progress include all the required student subgroups?	<p>Identifies subgroups for defining adequate yearly progress: economically disadvantaged, major racial and ethnic groups, students with disabilities, and students with limited English proficiency.</p> <p>Provides definition and data source of subgroups for adequate yearly progress.</p>	<p>State does not disaggregate data by each required student subgroup.</p>

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF <i>NOT</i> MEETING REQUIREMENTS
<p>STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS</p> <p>CSAP results for the AYP baseline year, 2002, have already been disaggregated for all of the required subgroups with the exception of socio-economic status. The data for this sub-group will be available for the 2002-2003 school year.</p> <p>Evidence of compliance was submitted to the Peer Reviewers on December 17, 2002.</p>		

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF <i>NOT</i> MEETING REQUIREMENTS
5.2 How are public schools and LEAs held accountable for the progress of student subgroups in the determination of adequate yearly progress?	Public schools and LEAs are held accountable for student subgroup achievement: economically disadvantaged, major ethnic and racial groups, students with disabilities, and limited English proficient students.	State does not include student subgroups in its State Accountability System.

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF <i>NOT</i> MEETING REQUIREMENTS
<p>STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS</p> <p>All student sub-groups of thirty or more must meet annual, measurable performance objectives in order for the school or district to make AYP. AYP is calculated separately for reading and math for each of the three instructional levels.</p> <p>The Peer Reviewers stated that they were “impressed” with the methodology, processes and procedures that CDE will use to assure timely acquisition of English by non-English speaking or limited-English speaking students.</p> <p>Evidence of compliance was submitted to the Peer Reviewers on December 17, 2002.</p>		

CRITICAL	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF <i>NOT</i> MEETING REQUIREMENTS
<p>5.3 How are students with disabilities included in the State's definition of adequate yearly progress?</p>	<p>All students with disabilities participate in statewide assessments: general assessments with or without accommodations or an alternate assessment based on grade level standards for the grade in which students are enrolled.</p> <p>State demonstrates that students with disabilities are fully included in the State Accountability System.</p>	<p>The State Accountability System or State policy excludes students with disabilities from participating in the statewide assessments.</p> <p>State cannot demonstrate that alternate assessments measure grade-level standards for the grade in which students are enrolled.</p>

CRITICAL	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF <i>NOT</i> MEETING REQUIREMENTS
<p>STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS</p> <p>All students with disabilities participate in the CSAP or the CSAP-Alternate. The CSAP-Alternate is intended for a very small percentage of students on Individual Education Plans who require significantly different instructional and technological supports to progress in their learning. Currently, the 4th grade CSAP-A for reading and writing measures emerging literacy skills. Additional grade-level and content CSAP-A's will be phased in over the next five years.</p> <p>Evidence of compliance was submitted to the Peer Reviewers on December 17, 2002.</p>		

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF NOT MEETING REQUIREMENTS
5.4 How are students with limited English proficiency included in the State's definition of adequate yearly progress?	<p>All LEP student participate in statewide assessments: general assessments with or without accommodations or a native language version of the general assessment based on grade level standards.</p> <p>State demonstrates that LEP students are fully included in the State Accountability System.</p>	<p>LEP students are not fully included in the State Accountability System.</p>

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF NOT MEETING REQUIREMENTS
<p>STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS</p> <p>The Peer Reviewers who visited Colorado on December the 17th, 2002, were “impressed” with Colorado’s approach to holding all schools and districts accountable for Limited English Proficient students. Colorado has developed an extensive, research-based process for assisting LEP students.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">State Academic Accountability Process for Limited English Proficient Students</p> <p>Colorado Senate Bill 186 mandates the assessment of students in reading, writing, language arts, math and science. Limited English Proficient students are not exempt from the Colorado Student Assessment Program (CSAP).</p> <p>The CSAP categorizes Limited English Proficient students under three language proficiency levels. <u>Non-English Proficient (NEP)</u>, Limited English Proficient (LEP) and Fluent English Proficient (FEP). The levels concur with proficiency levels on sanctioned language proficiency assessments.</p> <p>The law makes specific provisions for the assessment of Non-English Proficient students participating in Spanish/Bilingual Language Instruction Educational Programs to be assessed with the Spanish version of the CSAP (grades 3 and 4) or be exempt due to minimal English language proficiency.</p> <p>NEP students may be exempt for a period of up to three years, or be assessed, with adequate accommodations, as soon as they achieve a Limited English Proficiency level. In any event, LEP students will be tested in English after they have been in the United States for three consecutive years.</p> <p>All NEP students are issued an assessment booklet by the Assessment Unit. The booklet is adequately marked as prescribed on the student grid and returned to the state. If the student is exempt due to language circumstances the action constitutes a “0” score. These “0” scores are included in all accountability processes.</p> <p>Students in the Limited English and Fluent categories participate in the assessment. Their scores are included in all accountability processes.</p> <p>CDE is also working with an alternative English language assessment in cooperation with ten states. The design of the assessment will include the following elements: standards-based, formative, summative and diagnostic, measure English proficiency and language development, align language acquisition levels and grade level targets and provide a flexible administration format.</p> <p>Further Evidence of compliance was submitted to the Peer Reviewers on December 17, 2002.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Colorado Department of Education January 5, 2002</p>		

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF <i>NOT</i> MEETING REQUIREMENTS
5.5 What is the State's definition of the minimum number of students in a subgroup required for reporting purposes? For accountability purposes?	<p>State defines the number of students required in a subgroup for reporting and accountability purposes, and applies this definition consistently across the State.⁵</p> <p>Definition of subgroup will result in data that are statistically reliable.</p>	<p>State does not define the required number of students in a subgroup for reporting and accountability purposes.</p> <p>Definition is not applied consistently across the State.</p> <p>Definition does not result in data that are statistically reliable.</p>

⁵ The minimum number is not required to be the same for reporting and accountability.

STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS

There must be at least thirty students in every student sub-group for accountability purposes and sixteen for reporting purposes. When AYP is calculated, and in any circumstance where there are less than thirty students in a sub-group within a school, the AYP calculation for that sub-group will apply to the next level, e.g. the district or the state.

CDE's data analyses indicate that thirty best meets the criteria for validity and reliability, coupled with the application of confidence intervals. In addition, this procedure will assure the privacy of individual student results.

Please refer to Attachment "A". This information includes the recommendations of the Peer Reviewers from December 17, 2002.

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF <i>NOT</i> MEETING REQUIREMENTS
5.6 How does the State Accountability System protect the privacy of students when reporting results and when determining AYP?	Definition does not reveal personally identifiable information. ⁶	Definition reveals personally identifiable information.

⁶ The Family Education Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA) prohibits an LEA that receives Federal funds from releasing, without the prior written consent of a student's parents, any personally identifiable information contained in a student's education record.

STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS

There must be at least thirty students in every student sub-group for accountability and reporting purposes. When AYP is calculated, and in any circumstance where there are less than thirty students in a sub-group within a school, the AYP calculation for that sub-group will apply to the next level, e.g. the district or the state.

CDE's data analysis show that thirty best meets the criteria for validity and reliability, coupled with the application of confidence intervals. In addition, this procedure will assure the privacy of individual student results.

Please refer to Attachment "A". This information includes the recommendations of the Peer Reviewers from December 17, 2002.

PRINCIPLE 6. State definition of AYP is based primarily on the State's academic assessments.

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF <i>NOT</i> MEETING REQUIREMENTS
6.1 How is the State's definition of adequate yearly progress based primarily on academic assessments?	Formula for AYP shows that decisions are based primarily on assessments. ⁷ Plan clearly identifies which assessments are included in accountability.	Formula for AYP shows that decisions are based primarily on non-academic indicators or indicators other than the State assessments.

⁷ State Assessment System will be reviewed by the Standards and Assessments Peer Review Team.

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF NOT MEETING REQUIREMENTS
	<p>STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS</p> <p>Colorado's final assessment system under the 1994 reauthorization of ESEA received final approval from the United States Department of Education in July of 2001.</p> <p>CSAP spans grades 3 – 10 in reading and writing, grades 5 – 10 in math and grade 8 in science. Additionally, the ACT is administered to all juniors in Colorado high schools.</p> <p>The Colorado General Assembly has already passed legislation enabling the development and implementation of the remaining four assessments (two in math and two in science) over the next few years to fully comply with NCLB testing requirements.</p> <p>CSAP is designed to measure the degree to which all students have met Colorado's academic content standards.</p> <p>AYP calculations are based primarily on CSAP results.</p> <p>Evidence of compliance was submitted to the Peer Reviewers on December 17, 2002.</p>	

PRINCIPLE 7. State definition of AYP includes graduation rates for public High schools and an additional indicator selected by the State for public Middle and public Elementary schools (such as attendance rates).

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF NOT MEETING REQUIREMENTS
<p>7.1 What is the State definition for the public high school graduation rate?</p>	<p>State definition of graduation rate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Calculates the percentage of students, measured from the beginning of the school year, who graduate from public high school with a regular diploma (not including a GED or any other diploma not fully aligned with the state's academic standards) in the standard number of years; or, Uses another more accurate definition that has been approved by the Secretary; and Must avoid counting a dropout as a transfer. <p>Graduation rate is included (in the aggregate) for AYP, and disaggregated (as necessary) for use when applying the exception clause⁸ to make AYP.</p>	<p>State definition of public high school graduation rate does not meet these criteria.</p>

⁸ See USC 6311(b)(2)(I)(i), and 34 C.F.R. 200.20(b)

STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS

Graduation rates are calculated based upon high school graduates only. A graduate is a student who completes locally developed graduation requirements. If a student is not considered a graduate by the local board of education, then that student is not included in the graduation rate calculation.

Colorado's definition of graduation rate includes only those students who receive diplomas within the standard number of years. The graduation rate is a cumulative or longitudinal rate that calculates the number of students who actually graduate as a percent of those who were in membership and could have graduated over a four-year period from grades 9-12.

The definition does not allow for the inclusion of dropouts and does not allow the use of transfer to avoid counting a student as a dropout.

In addition, one of the accreditation indicators is dropout rate. Therefore, Colorado's accountability system holds schools and districts strictly accountable for the proper reporting of graduates and dropouts.

Evidence of compliance was submitted to the Peer Reviewers on December 17, 2002.

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF NOT MEETING REQUIREMENTS
<p>7.2 What is the State's additional academic indicator for public elementary schools for the definition of AYP? For public middle schools for the definition of AYP?</p>	<p>State defines the additional academic indicators, e.g., additional State or locally administered assessments not included in the State assessment system, grade-to-grade retention rates or attendance rates.⁹</p> <p>An additional academic indicator is included (in the aggregate) for AYP, and disaggregated (as necessary) for use when applying the exception clause to make AYP.</p>	<p>State has not defined an additional academic indicator for elementary and middle schools.</p>

⁹ NCLB only lists these indicators as examples.

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF <i>NOT</i> MEETING REQUIREMENTS
------------------	-----------------------------------	---

STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS

Because Colorado will look at the percentage of students in the advanced category on CSAP, and because CSAP meets all of the nationally recognized standards, including validity and reliability, this principle has been met. Please refer to Attachment “A” for details.

CDE is currently able to disaggregate these data as required consistent with the safe harbor provision of the law. In addition, Colorado accreditation expects all children, even those proficient, to advance to their highest potential. Measuring the percentage of students who are advanced from each sub-group will help to assure all students are represented in the advanced category on CSAP. This will have a direct impact on the number of students from all sub-groups who go onto post-secondary education.

In addition, Colorado’s assessment program, CSAP, was fully approved by the United States Department of Education in July of 2001.

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF <i>NOT</i> MEETING REQUIREMENTS
7.3 Are the State's academic indicators valid and reliable?	State has defined academic indicators that are valid and reliable. State has defined academic indicators that are consistent with nationally recognized standards, if any.	State has an academic indicator that is not valid and reliable. State has an academic indicator that is not consistent with nationally recognized standards. State has an academic indicator that is not consistent within grade levels.

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF <i>NOT</i> MEETING REQUIREMENTS
------------------	-----------------------------------	---

STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS

Because Colorado will look at the percentage of students proficient or advanced on CSAP, and because CSAP meets all of the nationally recognized standards, including validity and reliability, this principle has been met. Ninety-five percent confidence intervals will also be used when measuring AYP goals. Please refer to Attachment "A" for details.

CDE is currently able to disaggregate these data as required consistent with the safe harbor provision of the law.

In addition, Colorado's assessment program, CSAP, was fully approved by the United States Department of Education in July of 2001.

Evidence of compliance was submitted to the Peer Reviewers on December 17, 2002.

PRINCIPLE 8. AYP is based on reading/language arts and mathematics achievement objectives.

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF NOT MEETING REQUIREMENTS
8.1 Does the state measure achievement in reading/language arts and mathematics separately for determining AYP?	<p>State AYP determination for student subgroups, public schools and LEAs separately measures reading/language arts and mathematics.¹⁰</p> <p>AYP is a separate calculation for reading/language arts and mathematics for each group, public school, and LEA.</p>	State AYP determination for student subgroups, public schools and LEAs averages or combines achievement across reading/language arts and mathematics.

¹⁰ If the state has more than one assessment to cover its language arts standards, the State must create a method for including scores from all the relevant assessments.

STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS

AYP will be assessed – and a determination made annually – separately for reading and math for all school districts, schools, and for all required student sub-populations.

Evidence of compliance was submitted to the Peer Reviewers on December 17, 2002.

PRINCIPLE 9. State Accountability System is statistically valid and reliable.

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF NOT MEETING REQUIREMENTS
<p>9.1 How do AYP determinations meet the State's standard for acceptable reliability?</p>	<p>State has defined a method for determining an acceptable level of reliability (decision consistency) for AYP decisions.</p> <p>State provides evidence that decision consistency is (1) within the range deemed acceptable to the State, and (2) meets professional standards and practice.</p> <p>State publicly reports the estimate of decision consistency, and incorporates it appropriately into accountability decisions.</p> <p>State updates analysis and reporting of decision consistency at appropriate intervals.</p>	<p>State does not have an acceptable method for determining reliability (decision consistency) of accountability decisions, e.g., it reports only reliability coefficients for its assessments.</p> <p>State has parameters for acceptable reliability; however, the actual reliability (decision consistency) falls outside those parameters.</p> <p>State's evidence regarding accountability reliability (decision consistency) is not updated.</p>

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF NOT MEETING REQUIREMENTS
<p>STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS</p> <p>The reliability of CSAP is very high, and the standard error of measurement in the central score ranges is small, approximately ten scale score points. This information is reported to the public.</p> <p>Sample data runs submitted to the Peer Reviewers on December 17, 2002, describe acceptable levels of decision consistency for AYP decisions. Confidence intervals are a part of the decision process. This information will give CDE a level of consistency it deems acceptable. The sample data runs documents that these levels of decision consistency are acceptable with professional standards and practice. CDE will continue to run data on the information submitted with this application to work out any technical “bugs” that may be identified in the future. Making proper judgments on AYP is of paramount importance to CDE.</p> <p>This information will be shared with the public when AYP decisions are calculated and announced.</p> <p>CDE will annually analyze the level of consistency and make appropriate modifications, if necessary.</p>		

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF <i>NOT</i> MEETING REQUIREMENTS
9.2 What is the State's process for making valid AYP determinations?	State has established a process for public schools and LEAs to appeal an accountability decision.	State does not have a system for handling appeals of accountability decisions.

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF NOT MEETING REQUIREMENTS
	<p>STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS</p> <p>Any school or district may appeal decisions made regarding AYP to the state and/or school district. In the case of AYP decisions regarding schools, the school district must consider the appeal and render a final decision within 30 days, after the submission date of the appeal.</p> <p>Similarly, if a district appeals a decision regarding AYP, CDE must make a final determination within 30 days of the date of the appeal.</p> <p>CDE provides ongoing technical assistance to districts in how to calculate AYP and process all school improvement and corrective action activities, including appeals regarding AYP decisions.</p> <p>Evidence of compliance was submitted to the Peer Reviewers on December 17, 2002.</p>	

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF <i>NOT</i> MEETING REQUIREMENTS
9.3 How has the State planned for incorporating into its definition of AYP anticipated changes in assessments?	<p>State has a plan to maintain continuity in AYP decisions necessary for validity through planned assessment changes, and other changes necessary to comply fully with NCLB.¹¹</p> <p>State has a plan for including new public schools in the State Accountability System.</p> <p>State has a plan for periodically reviewing its State Accountability System, so that unforeseen changes can be quickly addressed.</p>	<p>State's transition plan interrupts annual determination of AYP.</p> <p>State does not have a plan for handling changes: e.g., to its assessment system, or the addition of new public schools.</p>

¹¹ Several events may occur which necessitate such a plan. For example, (1) the State may need to include additional assessments in grades 3-8 by 2005-2006; (2) the State may revise content and/or academic achievement standards; (3) the State may need to recalculate the starting point with the addition of new assessments; or (4) the State may need to incorporate the graduation rate or other indicators into its State Accountability System. These events may require new calculations of validity and reliability.

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF NOT MEETING REQUIREMENTS
<p>STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS</p> <p>The state testing program (CSAP) will expand to include math assessments in grades 3 and 4 by spring of 2004 and science assessments at the elementary and high school levels by spring 2005.</p> <p>As the math assessments are added to the state's assessment program, they will be included in calculating a school or school district's AYP. During the first year of a new test's administration, AYP will be calculated both with and without the new test. CDE will give school districts the option of including or not including the data in making AYP decisions. However, including or not including the data must be applied consistently across schools.</p> <p>Baselines for new schools will be based upon the district's most recent CSAP data. The district's most recent CSAP data, for reading and math, will become the baseline data applied to the new school for the first year of the school's operation. This data will be compared to the school's actual data generated during the first year of operation for first year AYP calculations. The data for the school in its second and subsequent years will be the data generated by the school's actual student assessment results. Future AYP determinations will be calculated based upon that school's actual student performance data.</p> <p>Students who attend a new school will be accounted for in year one of the school's operation by including those students' scores into the LEA's AYP calculation. The goal of 100% proficiency for all students will remain consistent with the 2013-2014 timeline.</p> <p>CDE will annually review how AYP decisions are applied regarding validity and reliability, and how AYP decisions influence a district or school's accreditation status.</p> <p>Evidence of compliance was submitted to the Peer Reviewers on December 17, 2002.</p>		

PRINCIPLE 10. In order for a public school or LEA to make AYP, the State ensures that it assessed at least 95% of the students enrolled in each subgroup.

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF NOT MEETING REQUIREMENTS
<p>10.1 What is the State's method for calculating participation rates in the State assessments for use in AYP determinations?</p>	<p>State has a procedure to determine the number of absent or untested students (by subgroup and aggregate).</p> <p>State has a procedure to determine the denominator (total enrollment) for the 95% calculation (by subgroup and aggregate).</p> <p>Public schools and LEAs are held accountable for reaching the 95% assessed goal.</p>	<p>The state does not have a procedure for determining the rate of students participating in statewide assessments.</p> <p>Public schools and LEAs are not held accountable for testing at least 95% of their students.</p>

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF NOT MEETING REQUIREMENTS
<p>STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS</p> <p>CDE tracks the number of students who participate and the number who do not participate in the CSAP. All students are included in the denominator for percentages. Colorado's definition of AYP requires that 95% of all students in all required student sub-populations participate in CSAP.</p> <p>School districts and schools that fail to reach the 95% participation threshold in and of the required student sub-populations with thirty or more students cannot make AYP.</p> <p>The inception of the state student ID system will allow for the more efficient and accurate student tracking as well.</p> <p>Evidence of compliance was submitted to the Peer Reviewers on December 17, 2002.</p>		

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF <i>NOT</i> MEETING REQUIREMENTS
10.2 What is the State's policy for determining when the 95% assessed requirement should be applied?	State has a policy that implements the regulation regarding the use of 95% allowance when the group is statistically significant according to State rules.	State does not have a procedure for making this determination.

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF <i>NOT</i> MEETING REQUIREMENTS
<p>STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS</p> <p>CSAP tracks student participation rates that can be disaggregated according to all student sub-groups required in the law.</p> <p>The 95% requirement is applied to any of the required subgroups of thirty or more students.</p> <p>Evidence of compliance was submitted to the Peer Reviewers on December 17, 2002.</p>		

Appendix A**Required Data Elements for State Report Card****1111(h)(1)(C)**

1. Information, in the aggregate, on student achievement at each proficiency level on the State academic assessments (disaggregated by race, ethnicity, gender, disability status, migrant status, English proficiency, and status as economically disadvantaged, except that such disaggregation shall not be required in a case in which the number of students in a category is insufficient to yield statistically reliable information or the results would reveal personally identifiable information about an individual student.
2. Information that provides a comparison between the actual achievement levels of each student subgroup and the State's annual measurable objectives for each such group of students on each of the academic assessments.
3. The percentage of students not tested (disaggregated by the student subgroups), except that such disaggregation shall not be required in a case in which the number of students in a category is insufficient to yield statistically reliable information or the results would reveal personally identifiable information about an individual student.
4. The most recent 2-year trend in student achievement in each subject area, and for each grade level, for the required assessments.
5. Aggregate information on any other indicators used by the State to determine the adequate yearly progress of students in achieving State academic achievement standards disaggregated by student subgroups.
6. Graduation rates for secondary school students disaggregated by student subgroups.
7. Information on the performance of local educational agencies in the State regarding making adequate yearly progress, including the number and names of each school identified for school improvement under section 1116.
8. The professional qualifications of teachers in the State, the percentage of such teachers teaching with emergency or provisional credentials, and the percentage of classes in the State not taught by highly qualified teachers, in the aggregate and disaggregated by high-poverty compared to low-poverty schools which (for this purpose) means schools in the top quartile of poverty and the bottom quartile of poverty in the State.

ATTACHMENT A
Colorado Department of Education

ADEQUATE YEARLY PROGRESS: READING, ELEMENTARY
PERFORMANCE OBJECTIVES AND GOALS
Percent Proficient by Group

12/27/02

YEAR	SCHOOL	RACE/ETHNICITY					Economically Disadvantaged	STUDENTS W/ DISABILITIES	LIMITED ENGLISH PROFICIENT
		WHITE	HISPANIC	BLACK	NAT.AMER.	ASIAN			
BASELINE PROFICIENT 2002	77.50	92.00	71.00	76.00	81.00	86.00	NA	51.00	59.00
1 st YEAR GROWTH TARGET	0.00	0.00	6.50	1.50	0.00	0.00	NA	26.50	18.50
2003 Objective	77.50	77.50	77.50	77.50	77.50	77.50	NA	77.50	77.50
2003 Actual									
Made AYP?									
% Advanced									
Made AYP?									
2002 Non Proficient	22.50	8.00	29.00	24.00	19.00	14.00	NA	49.00	41.00
2003 10% Non Proficient Target	20.25	7.20	26.10	21.60	17.10	12.60	NA	44.10	36.90
10% Actual									
2004 Objective	77.50	77.50	77.50	77.50	77.50	77.50	77.50	77.50	77.50
2004 Actual									
Made AYP?									
% Advanced									
Made AYP?									

10% Target									
10% Actual									
2005 Goal	83.14	83.14	83.14	83.14	83.14	83.14	83.14	83.14	83.14
2005 Actual									
Made AYP?									
% Advanced									
Made AYP?									
10% Target									
10% Actual									
2006 Objective	83.14	83.14	83.14	83.14	83.14	83.14	83.14	83.14	83.14
2006 Actual									
Made AYP?									
% Advanced									
Made AYP?									
10% Target									
10% Actual									
2007 Objective	83.14	83.14	83.14	83.14	83.14	83.14	83.14	83.14	83.14
2007 Actual									
Made AYP?									
% Advanced									
Made AYP?									
10% Target									
10% Actual									
2008 Goal	88.78	88.78	88.78	88.78	88.78	88.78	88.78	88.78	88.78
2008 Actual									
Made AYP?									
% Advanced									
Made AYP?									
10% Target									
10% Actual									
2009 Objective	88.78	88.78	88.78	88.78	88.78	88.78	88.78	88.78	88.78
2009 Actual									

Made AYP?									
% Advanced									
Made AYP?									
10% Target									
10% Actual									
2010 Objective	88.78	88.78	88.78	88.78	88.78	88.78	88.78	88.78	88.78
2010 Actual									
Made AYP?									
% Advanced									
Made AYP?									
10% Target									
10% Actual									
2011 Goal	94.42	94.42	94.42	94.42	94.42	94.42	94.42	94.42	94.42
2011 Actual									
Made AYP?									
% Advanced									
Made AYP?									
10% Target									
10% Actual									
2012 Objective	94.42	94.42	94.42	94.42	94.42	94.42	94.42	94.42	94.42
2012 Actual									
Made AYP?									
% Advanced									
Made AYP?									
10% Target									
10% Actual									
2013 Objective	94.42	94.42	94.42	94.42	94.42	94.42	94.42	94.42	94.42
2013 Actual									
Made AYP?									
% Advanced									
Made AYP?									
10% Target									

10% Actual									
2014 Goal	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
2014 Actual									
Made AYP?									
% Advanced									
Made AYP?									
10% Target									
10% Actual									

ADEQUATE YEARLY PROGRESS: READING, MIDDLE
PERFORMANCE OBJECTIVES AND GOALS
Percent Proficient by Group

12/27/02 – Colorado Department of Education

YEAR	SCHOOL	RACE/ETHNICITY					Economically Disadvantaged	STUDENTS W/ DISABILITIES	LIMITED ENGLISH PROFICIENT
		WHITE	HISPANIC	BLACK	NAT.AMER.	ASIAN			
BASELINE PROFICIENT 2002	74.60	91.00	67.00	75.00	80.00	87.00	NA	47.00	47.00
1 st YEAR GROWTH TARGET	0.00	0.00	7.60	0.00	0.00	0.00	NA	27.60	27.60
2003 Objective	74.60	74.60	74.60	74.60	74.60	74.60	NA	74.60	74.60
2003 Actual									
Made AYP?									
% Advanced									
Made AYP?									
2002 Non Proficient	25.40	9.00	33.00	25.00	20.00	13.00	NA	53.00	53.00
2003 10% Non Proficient Target	22.86	8.10	29.70	22.50	18.00	11.70	NA	47.70	47.70
10% Actual									
2004 Objective	74.60	74.60	74.60	74.60	74.60	74.60	NA	74.60	74.60
2004 Actual									
Made AYP?									
% Advanced									
Made AYP?									
10% Target									
10% Actual									
2005 Goal	80.95	80.95	80.95	80.95	80.95	80.95	80.95	80.95	80.95

Colorado Department of Education
January 5, 2002

2005 Actual									
Made AYP?									
% Advanced									
Made AYP?									
10% Target									
10% Actual									
2006 Objective	80.95	80.95	80.95	80.95	80.95	80.95	80.95	80.95	80.95
2006 Actual									
Made AYP?									
% Advanced									
Made AYP?									
10% Target									
10% Actual									
2007 Objective	80.95	80.95	80.95	80.95	80.95	80.95	80.95	80.95	80.95
2007 Actual									
Made AYP?									
% Advanced									
Made AYP?									
10% Target									
10% Actual									
2008 Goal	87.30	87.30	87.30	87.30	87.30	87.30	87.30	87.30	87.30
2008 Actual									
Made AYP?									
% Advanced									
Made AYP?									
10% Target									
10% Actual									
2009 Objective	87.30	87.30	87.30	87.30	87.30	87.30	87.30	87.30	87.30
2009 Actual									
Made AYP?									
% Advanced									
Made AYP?									

10% Target									
10% Actual									
2010 Objective	87.30	87.30	87.30	87.30	87.30	87.30	87.30	87.30	87.30
2010 Actual									
Made AYP?									
% Advanced									
Made AYP?									
10% Target									
10% Actual									
2011 Goal	93.65	93.65	93.65	93.65	93.65	93.65	93.65	93.65	93.65
2011 Actual									
Made AYP?									
% Advanced									
Made AYP?									
10% Target									
10% Actual									
2012 Objective	93.65	93.65	93.65	93.65	93.65	93.65	93.65	93.65	93.65
2012 Actual									
Made AYP?									
% Advanced									
Made AYP?									
10% Target									
10% Actual									
2013 Objective	93.65	93.65	93.65	93.65	93.65	93.65	93.65	93.65	93.65
2013 Actual									
Made AYP?									
% Advanced									
Made AYP?									
10% Target									
10% Actual									
2014 Goal	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
2014 Actual									

Made AYP?									
% Advanced									
Made AYP?									
10% Target									
10% Actual									

ADEQUATE YEARLY PROGRESS: READING, HIGH
PERFORMANCE OBJECTIVES AND GOALS
Percent Proficient by Group

12/27/02 – Colorado Department of Education

YEAR	SCHOOL	RACE/ETHNICITY					Economically Disadvantaged	STUDENTS W/ DISABILITIES	LIMITED ENGLISH PROFICIENT
		WHITE	HISPANIC	BLACK	NAT.AMER.	ASIAN			
BASELINE PROFICIENT 2002	80.30	91.00	68.00	77.00	78.00	84.00	NA	45.00	44.00
1 st YEAR GROWTH TARGET	0.00	0.00	12.30	3.30	2.30	0.00	NA	35.30	36.30
2003 Objective	80.30	80.30	80.30	80.30	80.30	80.30	NA	80.30	80.30
2003 Actual									
Made AYP?									
% Advanced									
Made AYP?									
2002 Non Proficient	19.70	9.00	32.00	23.00	22.00	16.00	NA	55.00	56.00
2003 10% Non Proficient Target	17.73	8.10	28.80	20.70	19.80	14.40	NA	49.50	50.40
10% Actual									
2004 Objective	80.30	80.30	80.30	80.30	80.30	80.30	80.30	80.30	80.30
2004 Actual									
Made AYP?									
% Advanced									
Made AYP?									
10% Target									
10% Actual									
2005 Goal	85.23	85.23	85.23	85.23	85.23	85.23	85.23	85.23	85.23

Colorado Department of Education
January 5, 2002

2005 Actual									
Made AYP?									
% Advanced									
Made AYP?									
10% Target									
10% Actual									
2006 Objective	85.23	85.23	85.23	85.23	85.23	85.23	85.23	85.23	85.23
2006 Actual									
Made AYP?									
% Advanced									
Made AYP?									
10% Target									
10% Actual									
2007 Objective	85.23	85.23	85.23	85.23	85.23	85.23	85.23	85.23	85.23
2007 Actual									
Made AYP?									
% Advanced									
Made AYP?									
10% Target									
10% Actual									
2008 Goal	90.16	90.16	90.16	90.16	90.16	90.16	90.16	90.16	90.16
2008 Actual									
Made AYP?									
% Advanced									
Made AYP?									
10% Target									
10% Actual									
2009 Objective	90.16	90.16	90.16	90.16	90.16	90.16	90.16	90.16	90.16
2009 Actual									
Made AYP?									
% Advanced									
Made AYP?									

10% Target									
10% Actual									
2010 Objective	90.16	90.16	90.16	90.16	90.16	90.16	90.16	90.16	90.16
2010 Actual									
Made AYP?									
% Advanced									
Made AYP?									
10% Target									
10% Actual									
2011 Goal	95.09	95.09	95.09	95.09	95.09	95.09	95.09	95.09	95.09
2011 Actual									
Made AYP?									
% Advanced									
Made AYP?									
10% Target									
10% Actual									
2012 Objective	95.09	95.09	95.09	95.09	95.09	95.09	95.09	95.09	95.09
2012 Actual									
Made AYP?									
% Advanced									
Made AYP?									
10% Target									
10% Actual									
2013 Objective	95.09	95.09	95.09	95.09	95.09	95.09	95.09	95.09	95.09
2013 Actual									
Made AYP?									
% Advanced									
Made AYP?									
10% Target									
10% Actual									
2014 Goal	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
2014 Actual									

Made AYP?									
% Advanced									
Made AYP?									
10% Target									
10% Actual									

ADEQUATE YEARLY PROGRESS: MATH, ELEMENTARY SCHOOL
PERFORMANCE OBJECTIVES AND GOALS
Percent Proficient by Group

12/27/02 – Colorado Department of Education

YEAR	SCHOOL	RACE/ETHNICITY					Economically Disadvantaged	STUDENTS W/ DISABILITIES	LIMITED ENGLISH PROFICIENT
		WHITE	HISPANIC	BLACK	NAT.AMER.	ASIAN			
BASELINE PROFICIENT 2002	79.50	92.00	71.00	70.00	77.00	88.00	NA	52.00	60.00
1 st YEAR GROWTH TARGET	0.00	0.00	8.50	9.50	2.50	0.00	NA	27.50	19.50
2003 Objective	79.50	79.50	79.50	79.50	79.50	79.50	NA	79.50	79.50
2003 Actual									
Made AYP?									
% Advanced									
Made AYP?									
2002 Non Proficient	20.50	8.00	29.00	30.00	23.00	12.00	NA	48.00	40.00
2003 10% Non Proficient Target	18.45	7.20	26.10	27.00	21.70	10.80	NA	43.20	36.00
10% Actual									
2004 Objective	79.50	79.50	79.50	79.50	79.50	79.50	79.50	79.50	79.50
2004 Actual									
Made AYP?									
% Advanced									
Made AYP?									
10% Target									
10% Actual									
2005 Goal	84.63	84.63	84.63	84.63	84.63	84.63	84.63	84.63	84.63

Colorado Department of Education
 January 5, 2002

2005 Actual									
Made AYP?									
% Advanced									
Made AYP?									
10% Target									
10% Actual									
2006 Objective	84.63	84.63	84.63	84.63	84.63	84.63	84.63	84.63	84.63
2006 Actual									
Made AYP?									
% Advanced									
Made AYP?									
10% Target									
10% Actual									
2007 Objective	84.63	84.63	84.63	84.63	84.63	84.63	84.63	84.63	84.63
2007 Actual									
Made AYP?									
% Advanced									
Made AYP?									
10% Target									
10% Actual									
2008 Goal	89.76	89.76	89.76	89.76	89.76	89.76	89.76	89.76	89.76
2008 Actual									
Made AYP?									
% Advanced									
Made AYP?									
10% Target									
10% Actual									
2009 Objective	89.76	89.76	89.76	89.76	89.76	89.76	89.76	89.76	89.76
2009 Actual									
Made AYP?									
% Advanced									
Made AYP?									

10% Target									
10% Actual									
2010 Objective	89.76	89.76	89.76	89.76	89.76	89.76	89.76	89.76	89.76
2010 Actual									
Made AYP?									
% Advanced									
Made AYP?									
10% Target									
10% Actual									
2011 Goal	94.89	94.89	94.89	94.89	94.89	94.89	94.89	94.89	94.89
2011 Actual									
Made AYP?									
% Advanced									
Made AYP?									
10% Target									
10% Actual									
2012 Objective	94.89	94.89	94.89	94.89	94.89	94.89	94.89	94.89	94.89
2012 Actual									
Made AYP?									
% Advanced									
Made AYP?									
10% Target									
10% Actual									
2013 Objective	94.89	94.89	94.89	94.89	94.89	94.89	94.89	94.89	94.89
2013 Actual									
Made AYP?									
% Advanced									
Made AYP?									
10% Target									
10% Actual									
2014 Goal	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
2014 Actual									

Made AYP?									
% Advanced									
Made AYP?									
10% Target									
10% Actual									

ADEQUATE YEARLY PROGRESS: MATH, MIDDLE SCHOOL
PERFORMANCE OBJECTIVES AND GOALS
Percent Proficient by Group

12/27/02 – Colorado Department of Education

YEAR	SCHOOL	RACE/ETHNICITY					Economically Disadvantaged	STUDENTS W/ DISABILITIES	LIMITED ENGLISH PROFICIENT
		WHITE	HISPANIC	BLACK	NAT.AMER.	ASIAN			
BASELINE PROFICIENT 2002	60.70	84.00	53.00	53.00	64.00	82.00	NA	33.00	41.00
1 st YEAR GROWTH TARGET	0.00	0.00	7.70	7.70	0.00	0.00	NA	27.70	19.70
2003 Objective	60.70	60.70	60.70	60.70	60.70	60.70	NA	60.70	60.70
2003 Actual									
Made AYP?									
% Advanced									
Made AYP?									
2002 Non Proficient	39.30	16.00	47.00	47.00	36.00	18.00	NA	67.00	59.00
2003 10% Non Proficient Target	35.37	14.40	42.30	42.30	32.40	16.20	NA	60.30	53.10
10% Actual									
2004 Objective	60.70	60.70	60.70	60.70	60.70	60.70	60.70	60.70	60.70
2004 Actual									
Made AYP?									
% Advanced									
Made AYP?									
10% Target									
10% Actual									
2005 Goal	70.53	70.53	70.53	70.53	70.53	70.53	70.53	70.53	70.53

Colorado Department of Education
 January 5, 2002

2005 Actual									
Made AYP?									
% Advanced									
Made AYP?									
10% Target									
10% Actual									
2006 Objective	70.53	70.53	70.53	70.53	70.53	70.53	70.53	70.53	70.53
2006 Actual									
Made AYP?									
% Advanced									
Made AYP?									
10% Target									
10% Actual									
2007 Objective	70.53	70.53	70.53	70.53	70.53	70.53	70.53	70.53	70.53
2007 Actual									
Made AYP?									
% Advanced									
Made AYP?									
10% Target									
10% Actual									
2008 Goal	80.36	80.36	80.36	80.36	80.36	80.36	80.36	80.36	80.36
2008 Actual									
Made AYP?									
% Advanced									
Made AYP?									
10% Target									
10% Actual									
2009 Objective	80.36	80.36	80.36	80.36	80.36	80.36	80.36	80.36	80.36
2009 Actual									
Made AYP?									
% Advanced									
Made AYP?									

10% Target									
10% Actual									
2010 Objective	80.36	80.36	80.36	80.36	80.36	80.36	80.36	80.36	80.36
2010 Actual									
Made AYP?									
% Advanced									
Made AYP?									
10% Target									
10% Actual									
2011 Goal	90.19	90.19	90.19	90.19	90.19	90.19	90.19	90.19	90.19
2011 Actual									
Made AYP?									
% Advanced									
Made AYP?									
10% Target									
10% Actual									
2012 Objective	90.19	90.19	90.19	90.19	90.19	90.19	90.19	90.19	90.19
2012 Actual									
Made AYP?									
% Advanced									
Made AYP?									
10% Target									
10% Actual									
2013 Objective	90.19	90.19	90.19	90.19	90.19	90.19	90.19	90.19	90.19
2013 Actual									
Made AYP?									
% Advanced									
Made AYP?									
10% Target									
10% Actual									
2014 Goal	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
2014 Actual									

Made AYP?									
% Advanced									
Made AYP?									
10% Target									
10% Actual									

ADEQUATE YEARLY PROGRESS: MATH, HIGH SCHOOL
PERFORMANCE OBJECTIVES AND GOALS
Percent Proficient by Group

12/27/02 – Colorado Department of Education

YEAR	SCHOOL	RACE/ETHNICITY					Economically Disadvantaged	STUDENTS w/ DISABILITIES	LIMITED ENGLISH PROFICIENT
		WHITE	HISPANIC	BLACK.	NAT.AMER.	ASIAN			
BASELINE E PROFICIENT 2002	50.50	73.00	33.00	33.00	46.00	70.00	NA	17.00	21.00
1 st YEAR GROWTH TARGET	0.00	0.00	17.50	17.50	4.50	0.00	NA	33.50	29.50
2003 Objective	50.50	50.50	50.50	50.50	50.50	50.50	NA	50.50	50.50
2003 Actual									
Made AYP?									
% Advanced									
Made AYP?									
2002 Non Proficient	49.50	27.00	67.00	67.00	54.00	30.00	NA	83.00	79.00
2003 10% Non Proficient Target	44.55	24.30	60.30	60.30	48.60	27.00	NA	74.70	71.10
10% Actual									
2004 Objective	50.50	50.50	50.50	50.50	50.50	50.50	50.50	50.50	50.50
2004 Actual									
Made AYP?									
% Advanced									
Made AYP?									
10% Target									
10% Actual									
2005 Goal	62.89	62.89	62.89	62.89	62.89	62.89	62.89	62.89	62.89

Colorado Department of Education
January 5, 2002

2005 Actual									
Made AYP?									
% Advanced									
Made AYP?									
10% Target									
10% Actual									
2006 Objective	62.89	62.89	62.89	62.89	62.89	62.89	62.89	62.89	62.89
2006 Actual									
Made AYP?									
% Advanced									
Made AYP?									
10% Target									
10% Actual									
2007 Objective	62.89	62.89	62.89	62.89	62.89	62.89	62.89	62.89	62.89
2007 Actual									
Made AYP?									
% Advanced									
Made AYP?									
10% Target									
10% Actual									
2008 Goal	75.28	75.28	75.28	75.28	75.28	75.28	75.28	75.28	75.28
2008 Actual									
Made AYP?									
% Advanced r									
Made AYP?									
10% Target									
10% Actual									
2009 Objective	75.28	75.28	75.28	75.28	75.28	75.28	75.28	75.28	75.28
2009 Actual									
Made AYP?									
% Advanced									
Made AYP?									

10% Target									
10% Actual									
2010 Objective	75.28	75.28	75.28	75.28	75.28	75.28	75.28	75.28	75.28
2010 Actual									
Made AYP?									
% Advanced									
Made AYP?									
10% Target									
10% Actual									
2011 Goal	87.67	87.67	87.67	87.67	87.67	87.67	87.67	87.67	87.67
2011 Actual									
Made AYP?									
% Advanced									
Made AYP?									
10% Target									
10% Actual									
2012 Objective	87.67	87.67	87.67	87.67	87.67	87.67	87.67	87.67	87.67
2012 Actual									
Made AYP?									
% Advanced									
Made AYP?									
10% Target									
10% Actual									
2013 Objective	87.67	87.67	87.67	87.67	87.67	87.67	87.67	87.67	87.67
2013 Actual									
Made AYP?									
% Advanced									
Made AYP?									
10% Target									
10% Actual									
2014 Goal	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
2014 Actual									

Made AYP?									
% Advanced									
Made AYP?									
10% Target									
10% Actual									